



# Minutes NV COMMUNICATIONS STEERING COMMITTEE

<b>DATE</b>	June 8, 2005
<b>TIME</b>	9:00 am - Noon
<b>LOCATION</b>	2525 South Carson St – Carson City 555 East Washington – Las Vegas
<b>RECORDER</b>	Maggie Thorne

## ATTENDANCE

Carson City Members	Present	Las Vegas Members	Present
Terry Savage, Co-Chair, Dept of Information Technology	✓	Jack Staley, Co-Chair LV Valley Water District	✓
Robert Chisel, Dept of Transportation	✓	Dennis Cobb, LV Metro Police Dept	✓
Neil Harris, Elko County Sheriff's Office	✓	Anthony DeMeo, Nye County	
Mark Foxen, NV Health Division	✓	Rod Massey, Clark County	
Kay Scherer, Dept of CNR	✓	Ronda Hornbeck, Lincoln Cty	
Major Bob Wideman	✓		
Dan Newell, City of Yerington			
James Johns, Reno Police Dept			
Chris Lake, NV Hospital Association	✓		
Dan Holler, Douglas County	✓		
Pete Menicucci, NV Nat'l Guard	✓		

## Staff

Name	Present	Name	Present
Mark Blomstrom, Dept of Information Technology	✓	Gladys Myler, Attorney General's Office	✓
Maggie Thorne, Dept of Information Technology	✓		

## I. CALL TO ORDER

Terry Savage called the meeting to order at 9.00 am.

## II ROLL CALL/MINUTES

The roll call was conducted by Maggie Thorne. Present: 11 members, 0 alternates.  
Absent: 5

The minutes from the 05/09/05 were reviewed. **Dennis Cobb made a motion seconded by Bob Wideman to approved the minutes as presented. Motion carried.**

### **III. HOMELAND SECURITY COMMISSION**

Jerry Keller, Vice Chair of HSC was introduced by Terry Savage. Mr. Keller mentioned he was honored to attend this meeting of the NV Communications Steering Committee and indicated he was impressed with the technical skills of Committee. He also commented he was impressed with the rapid and consistent pace they have made with regards to creating an interoperability plan and was looking forward to seeing the first draft in July.

### **IV. SAFECOM Status**

Dr. David Boyd, SAFECOM Director explained the history of SAFECOM to all the members and how SAFECOM is working with the State of Nevada, primarily NCSC and the development of an interoperability Plan. Dr. Boyd distributed to all members a copy of June 8, 2005 update of SAFECOM's progress to date as well as SAFECOM's report on their interim assessment of Nevada's draft Statewide Strategic Plan For Communications Interoperability.

Dr. Boyd did confirm to members that P25 standards were not a mandate of the Federal Government.

### **V. COMMUNICATION PLAN DISCUSSION**

Terry Savage opened discussion by presenting members with a copy of the draft plan revised from the May meeting with a few minor format changes for readability. He indicated that one piece missing was discussion on standards (i.e. P25) and though he did not expect to finish a discussion on P25, he did feel it was important to address. He indicated that the committee could 1) not take a position on P25, 2) mandate P25, 3) ban P25, or 4) basically do whatever as a Committee. Terry than asked for a poll of comments from members on P25:

Robert Chisel: *"Going to a P25 phase 1 standard that does not improve operations (in fact inhibits operations) or improve operability seems to be a lot of money to certain vendors to make them wealthy and doesn't do anything for us – we should be going to digital standards that are farther out and would help operability/interoperability. P25 phase one is not forward compatible with phase two so are we going to strand ourselves once again, let's look at something farther out that is a digital standard that is really going to meet our needs."*

Dennis Cobb: *"My prospective is P25 capability not compliance is probably okay. I am a bit undecided at the moment because of my concern for small entities (rural volunteer fire departments for example that operate just fine on analog VHS systems) being unable to buy radios without paying for features that they probably will never use. I am not sure that one size fits every radio in the State standard is exactly the right way to go, but for large systems and urban areas and major entities in the state that a P25 capability standard isn't going to be a big imposition and will recover the additional costs down the road as the standards get stabilized and systems get moving over that way. I would also say that we should define it pretty precisely and get SAFECOM's assistance on this."*

Mark Foxen: *"I don't have a comment on it at this point, but I do agree with Robert (Chisel) on going with the standards and what it is going to do with us – I'm still trying to get it all together here."*

Neil Harris: *"It's unfortunate that the P25 issue has been so muddled over the time we have been trying to study this issue – I don't have a problem with the P25 capable."*

*Smaller entities in Elko County can't afford to go with P25 standard radios, but if they are P25 capable with digital without a mandate I don't have a problem with that."*

Dan Holler: *"In general, we are looking at P25 standards for purpose of capability, the challenge we have now is that if you buy a radio now with a 3-5 year life, you don't want to spend a lot of money on a radio you don't need and so, setting a date and target would be extremely beneficial for that standard. Setting the standard would be helpful so you know at what point, depending on how you change out your radios. Interfacing of the systems is going to be as critical to the 4 core system. P25 standards is probably going to be the standard that's going to be, we may not know what it looks like yet, but I think it is going to be the standard. I suppose I support setting it out there and saying that is what we are working towards so we have a common ability."*

Chris Lake: *I guess I would echo all the comments. I think we need a target date out their so we can focus our energies on which way to go but I also think focusing on the core-four, the way we started with this committee should remain our primary focus."*

Pete Menicucci: *"Most has been said...as Dr. Boyd stated P25 is the closest thing we have to a standard so we should shoot for a P25 standard at phase two or three capable and mandate or recommend that a black box solution be provided by State for the small organizations that can't provide an interface."*

Kay Scherer: *"Most of my notes have already been said – we should have a target standard and a target date, but I think the key is flexibility. I think we have had the most common sense discussion today that we had talking about systems of systems and the fact that the ultimate goal of this group is interoperability – we need to focus on the core-four and find a dovetail where the P25 standard can be set with a reasonable date. If we don't set target dates we will just be talking another four years."*

Bob Wideman: *"I think it is important for us to have direction and a mission and an end game to accomplish and from that stand point, setting of dates is important. At the same time I'm not sure how realistic it is to set dates for compliance with a thing that is still influx and not yet defined. I also think as those definitions go forward and the major vendors are focusing their efforts for complying with those issues at some point (not in the very near future) it will really be impracticable to buy anything else so I think the purchasing decisions will tend to take care of themselves as the future rolls on but in general setting of a date that we would like to be at a certain place at a certain time certainly sets our policy but we need the flexibility to deal with that as circumstances change."*

Jack Staley: *I support standards, but I also believe the federal government and vendors have a responsibility to actively progress through the next five/eight years of being responsible to assure that whatever is available to everybody to meet standards is interoperable and I think we also need to be concerned with the small radio systems around the state so they are protected and still able to meet their individual needs."*

Terry Savage: *"I am going to try to include what I heard from the other folks in my own comments – in terms of open standards vs. proprietary everybody knows who won the MAC/PC wars – it's clear what the market place favors over time. What we are looking for is general convergence; we are not going to get \$2M to do whatever our change is instantly. What I propose is that I write up a proposal for a vote at our June 28 meeting. That proposal would be that we require P25 capable equipment purchased after July*

*2010 to whatever the complete standard is with the clear understanding of having an exception."*

Terry said the proposal would be to emphasize P25 capability rather than compliance to the then current standard, the date will be between 2007 and 2010 and the Committee would be explicit on the process for getting exemptions. Terry asked for any concerns or wording from the members by e-mail on the drafting of this proposal.

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at noon. Next meeting date: June 28, 2005

Minutes are posted on the website at: <http://ncsc.nv.gov/>

Questions Call: 775-684-5859 or email [maggiet@doit.state.nv.us](mailto:maggiet@doit.state.nv.us)

Draft minutes submitted by Maggie Thorne, 06/13/05

APPROVED: \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_